UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| 10/589,845 | 08/18/2006 | Stephen Gilbert | 06005/41115 | 2795 |
| | 7590 11/19/200 GERSTEIN & BORUN | EXAMINER | | |
| 233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE | | | GOOD JOHNSON, MOTILEWA | |
| 6300 SEARS T CHICAGO, IL | = | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2628 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 11/19/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 10/589,845 | GILBERT ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| M GOOD JOHNSON | 2628 | |

| | M GOOD JOHNSON | 2628 | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 19 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejection | n. | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount on the nortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS. | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS 2 M. The prepared emendment/s) filed ofter a finel rejection by | ut prior to the data of filing a brief | will not be entered be | 001100 | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett | sideration and/or search (see NOT v); | E below); | | | | |
| appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c | | ected claims. | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.12 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | , ,, | mpliant Amandmant (I | DTOL 224) | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | Inpliant Amendment (I | - TOL-324). | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allown-allowable claim(s). | | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) the how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | be entered and an ex | xplanation of | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-37</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but | hafara or on the data of filing a No | utica of Annoal will not | ha antarad | | | |
| because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | /ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | s to provide a). | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. | | | |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been consideration because: | red but does NOT place the applic | ation in condition for a | allowance | | | |
| See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | |
| 12. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (| PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | |
| 13. Other: | | | | | | |
| | (Motilous Cood Johann | n/ | | | | |
| | /Motilewa Good-Johnso Primary Examiner, Art U | | | | | |

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment raises the new issue of the routine altering the manner in which the graphic representation of the process entity is displayed.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues the 101 issued in the final office action mailed 07/09/2009. Examiner maintains the 101 rejection issued in the final office action, because the claims as amended were not directed to a substantial and specific utility and were non-statutory. Claim 26 is directed to a graphical display device comprising . . . a graphical display and dependent claims 27-36 were directed to the graphical display and not the graphical display device. Claim 15 recited a computer readable medium; however dependent claims 16-25 were directed to a graphic display editor, which is non-statutory .